m/

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,383	09/25/2003	Daniel A. Rose	CA920010050US1	1866

7590 03/29/2007 Marilyn S. Dawkins International Business Machines Intellectual Property Law 11400 Burnet Road Austin, TX 78758	**EXAMINER** NEWAY, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/25/03</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is responsive to the Application filed on 25 September 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for
> patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by
> the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application
> filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of
> an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1 –7, 9 – 14, 16 – 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Abel et al. (US PGPub 2003/0084401).

Claim 1:

Abel discloses a method implemented on a computer system for validating the

contents of a locale source file, which comprises information arranged by categories,

keywords and elements (Abstract), said method comprising:

detecting one or more of each of said categories, keywords and elements in said

locale source file (FIG. 3 and related text); extracting one or more of said elements with

associated values from said locale source file ("the appropriate localized property

values associated with a selected characteristic are automatically applied to each

control instance ..." [0009], FIG. 10 and related text),

storing each of said extracted elements as textual data in an element storage

area ("property values are preferably obtained from a cached resource file" [0009]),

formatting a text string of data using said textual data ("During the rendering of

the Web page, the appropriate localized property values associated with a selected

characteristic are automatically applied to each control instance that is found to include

the key" [0009]), and

validating said text string ("user then reviews the localization elements ..."

[0047]).

Claim 2:

Abel discloses the method of claim 1, wherein each said element further

comprises at least one value (FIG. 3 and related text).

Claim 3:

Abel discloses the method of claim 2 wherein the steps of extracting one or more

or said elements and storing each said extracted element comprises: labeling each said

element storage area with a storage identifier ("element key", FIG. 3 and related text);

obtaining a set of keyword directives; and extracting each said keyword, and each said

element and associated value within said keyword from said categories into said

element storage area in accordance with said set of keyword directives ([0045], FIG. 6

and related text).

Claim 4:

Abel discloses the method of claim 3 wherein, said storage area identifier further

comprises: a locale source file category identifier and associated keyword identifier

(FIG. 3 and related text).

Claim 5:

Abel discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the step of formatting a text string of data comprises: obtaining said textual data from said element storage area; obtaining a set of text generation rules, patterns and substitution information; formatting said text string of data, using said textual data, element by element, by applying said set of text generation rules, patterns and substitution information to each said text string of data ("During the rendering of the Web page, the appropriate localized property values associated with a selected characteristic are automatically applied to each control instance that is found to include the key..." [0009]).

Claim 6:

Abel discloses the method of claim 5, further comprising; displaying one or more of said text string of data to users ("An instance of the LocalizedPage class sets control property values upon rendering the page downloaded from the server into the client computer's display" [0043]).

Claim 7:

Abel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the step of validating said text string comprises the steps of; comparing said text string of data with a reference string; determining when said text string of data differs from said reference string; providing an associated change for said text string of data when indicated by said determining step; and applying said change to said textual data ([0047], FIG. 7 and related text).

Claims 9 – 14:

Claims 9 – 14 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 7 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 20, and 23 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 7 and are

rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 21:

Abel discloses the system of claim 16 further comprising means for configuring

said system to operate in a distributed computing environment (FIG. 2 and related text).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 8, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Abel et al. (US PGPub 2003/0084401) in view of Schumacher et al. (USPN

6,219,632).

Claim 8:

Abel discloses the method of any one of claim 1, but he does not disclose

wherein said locale source file is a POSIX form.

Schumacher discloses a method for managing and translating information across

different locales where the locale files could be POSIX (col. 3, lines 58-61).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to make the locale source file in Abel's method a POSIX locale because a

POSIX locale is an "internationalization standard" (Schumacher, col.3, lines 58-61).

Claims 15 and 22:

Claims 15 and 22 are similar in scope and content to claim 8 and are rejected

with the same rationale.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Meade et al. (USPN 6,453,462) discloses a method, which converts a base

language data to produce an internationalization test data.

Moses et al. (US PGPub 2003/0079051) discloses a method for creating multi-

cultural software applications according to a given locale.

Ng (USPN 5,812,122) discloses system for testing locale-specific language

modules.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-

1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN

$S\!N$

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600